



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,188	09/25/2002	Po-Sheng Shih	AVIP0029USA	6306

27765 7590 02/20/2004

NAIPO (NORTH AMERICA INTERNATIONAL PATENT OFFICE)
P.O. BOX 506
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MIKE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2182

DATE MAILED: 02/20/2004

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/065,188

Applicant(s)

SHIH ET AL.

Examiner

Mike Nguyen

Art Unit

2182

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Notices & Remarks

1. Claims 1-7 are pending for the examination.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to because they do not lend themselves to assist in the understanding of the disclosure.

Oath/Declaration

3. The Declaration is objected to because the declaration appears application is attempted to claim foreign priority under 35 USC 119(a)-(d) but the declaration fails to clearly state this.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: misspelling an "offeeding" (see claim 6 line 2). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakura (U.S. Pat. No. 6,122,684) in view of Haba (U.S. Pat. No. 6,648,226 B2).

6. As to claim 1, Sakura teaches an application for being installed in a computer system for controlling a plurality of scanners connected to the computer system being capable of feeding

Art Unit: 2182

documents automatically, the scanners parallel-connected to the computer system via an interface (see fig. 1 and col. 3 line 43 to col. 4 line 9), the application comprising: a scan code for controlling the scanners parallelly, a plurality of image files generated by the scanners scanning documents transferring to the computer system (see col. 3 lines 55-64 and col. 5 lines 8-10); and a sort code for sorting the images files (see fig. 3 element S23 and fig. 4 element 33 col. 5 lines 26-38).

Although the application disclosed by Sakura shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to explicitly teach: the interface selecting from a group consisting of IEEE 1394, USB, and SCSI interfaces. Haba; however; teaches: the interface selecting from a group consisting of IEEE 1394, USB, and SCSI interfaces (see col. 5 lines 28-32). Given the teaching of Haba, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Sakura by employing the well-known or conventional feature of the application, such as taught by Haba, in order to provide various interfaces of the plurality of scanners connecting to the computer system.

7. As to claim 2, Sakura teaches the application of claim 1 further comprising a post-process code for post-processing the sorted imaged files (see col. 5 lines 45-55).

8. As to claim 3, Sakura teaches the application of claim 2 wherein the computer system comprises a host computer and client computer (see fig. 1 element 100 and col. 3 lines 42-45), and the sort code and the scan code are installed in the client computer (see fig. 3 element S23 and fig. 4 element 33 col. 5 lines 26-38 and col. 3 lines 55-64 and col. 5 lines 8-10) and the post-process code is installed in the host computer (see col. 5 lines 45-55).

Art Unit: 2182

9. As to claim 4, Sakura teaches the application of claim 1 wherein the sort code compares the scan times of each scanner simultaneously to determined the sequences of the images files generated by the scanners scanning documents (see col. 5 lines 26-38 wherein the table shown in fig. 4 indicates the re-arranged order of the plurality of scanners).

10. As to claim 5, Sakura teaches the application of claim 1 wherein the sort code sorts the images files generated by the scanners scanning documents based on the sequences of the scanners operating and the priority of the scanners (see col. 5 lines 26-44).

11. Claims 6-7 are directed to a method implementing the application as set forth in claims 1-2. Since Sakura and Haba teach the application as set forth in claims 1-2; therefore, they also teach the method as set forth in claims 6-7.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,493,757 B1 (Sakai et al.)

U.S. Pat. No. 6,349,879 B1 (Watanabe et al.)

U.S. Pat. No. 5,123,063 (Ohkubo)

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-5040 or e-mail is mike.nguyen@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

The appropriate fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Jeffrey Gaffin, can be reached on (703) 308-3301.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Application/Control Number: 10/065,188

Page 5

Art Unit: 2182



JEFFREY GAFFIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Mike Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 2182

02/17/2004